

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS**

PAMELA ALTMAN,

Plaintiff,

v.

**DEPARTMENT OF CHILDREN
AND FAMILY SERVICES; KARENA
GLEASON; NELSON ADAMS;
BILL PEYTON; and PETE WESSEL;**

Defendants.

No. 06-CV-0771-WDS-DGW

ORDER

STIEHL, District Judge

Before the Court is plaintiff, Pamela Altman's, motion for leave to file her Response to Defendants' Motion for Summary Judgment *instante*, and to be permitted to file a brief of 28 pages, and for leave to file her reply brief to defendant's response to plaintiff's cross motion for summary. (Doc. No. 64). This motion arose, apparently, from counsel's difficulty with attaching documents to the reply and then successfully filing these documents with the Courts electronic filing system, CM/ECF.¹ In fact, however, both the response with at least some attachments (attachments 1-27) was actually filed as Doc. 63 in the record, and the plaintiff also filed a reply (Doc. 65) to defendant's response to plaintiff's motion for summary judgment which also contains 4 attachments. Plaintiff, as part of her motion, seeks leave to file additional attachments as a supplemental pleading in support of the response to defendant's motion for summary judgment.

Upon review of the record, the Court **GRANTS** in part and **DENIES** in part plaintiff's motion

¹Counsel for plaintiff has advised the Court that he attempted to comply with the deadline for filing but that certain document files were too long and the plaintiff was forced to re-file the motion without the attachments.

as follows:

- A. The motion for leave to file *instanter* (Doc. 64), is **DENIED** as moot, in light of the fact that the response has been filed at Document 63. The Court will consider the response in its entirety (at 28 pages in length), and this response will not be stricken by the Clerk of the Court as overly long.
- B. The Court **GRANTS** plaintiff leave to file any additional attachments which have not already been filed as part of Document 63 as a separate document which shall be entitled, "Supplement to Response to Defendant's Motion for Summary Judgment." This supplement, and any non-duplicate exhibits, shall be filed on or before September 19, 2008.
- C. Plaintiff's motion for leave to file a reply to defendant's response to plaintiff's motion for summary judgment is **DENIED** as moot, that document having already been filed at Doc. 65.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED: September 16, 2008

s/WILLIAM D. STIEHL
DISTRICT JUDGE